



1061816

DRAFT

**Summary Of The
Animas Stakeholders Group Meeting
Silverton, CO
March 14, 1996**

Attendees (35): Peter Butler and Si Irwin (FOAR); Bill Goodhard and Larry Perino (Sunnyside Gold); Chris Hayes (Echo Bay); Paul Krabacher (DMG); Greg Parsons, Bob Owen, and Dave Holm (WQCD); Steve Fearn (Silver Wing); Richard Perino (San Juan County); Camille Farrel (CDPHE); Bill Simon (Basin Coordinator); Jerry Sandell (Howardsville Mill); Paul von Guerard and Win Wright (USGS); Carol Russell (EPA); Stan Powers (USBR); Gary Thrash (BLM); Sara Staber (River Watch, Inc); Katherine Foster (USFS); Karen Kiosbaugh (AGO); Terry Morris (Silverton); Barb Horn (DOW); Chris George (St. Paul Ski Lodge); Kevin deKay (Silverton); Jim Melcher (Melcher Brothers); Dave Emery (Silverton Standard); Electa Draper (Durango Harold); Mike Marcus (McCalley, Frick & Gilman); Dennis Scheminski (Scheminske & Associates); Bill McCarty (SGC); John Trujillo (Geologist); Ron Trujillo (Geologist); and Gary Broetzman (CCEM).

Agenda

The summary of the January 31, 1996 meeting was discussed and accepted with minimal change. The draft agenda for this meeting was followed with the first half of the meeting devoted to further discussion of the agreement entered into between Sunnyside Gold and the WQCD. The following summarizes the discussion on the agreement and the key points covered during the rest of the meeting.

Public Meeting -- Sunnyside Gold/WQCD (CDPHE) Agreement

Dave Holm, Director of the WQCD, again was present to discuss the overall features of the agreement entered into between Sunnyside and the WQCD. The agreement pertains to a settlement of legal and regulatory issues between the two parties leading to the eventual closure of the Sunnyside Mine. It was preliminarily discussed at the January 31 meeting and made available for public comment on March 4. Dave emphasized that the agreement is based on a no net degradation in water quality in the Basin. Bill Goodhard with Sunnyside and Chris Hayes with Echo Bay provided insight from the companies' perspectives. Key features of the agreement are the plugging of the American and Terry Tunnels, temporary treatment of Cement Creek flows through the existing Sunnyside treatment plant, seven "A" list off-site projects that will be started upon the filing of the agreement in District Court, an additional two projects on the "B" list and other possible contingency activities that would be activated by water quality monitoring at station A-72, alkaline additives injected into the mine workings as they fill, engineering-level studies of remediation at the Kohler site, and a financial transaction of \$200,000 to the State for discretionary use. These activities will take at least seven years to complete.

The comment period extends through April 4. Many clarifying questions were asked along with several general comments. Upon completion of the questions/comments, several people expressed overall comments on the agreements. They were all in general support of the agreement, with some positions somewhat more guarded and qualified.

Relationship of Agreement with Ongoing Stakeholders Project

A general discussion ensued over of the relationships between the Sunnyside and Stakeholders activities. The Group expressed interest in closely coordinating with the State and Sunnyside on upcoming activities. The Monitoring Workgroup was asked to begin the coordination of sampling activities and schedules in the interest of avoiding duplication of work. That is to begin on the next day (March 15). Similarly, the Feasibility Studies Workgroup was asked to modify its workplan activities to assure compatibility with the Sunnyside projects. That, also,

was to begin on the following day. In both cases, Bill Goodhard assured the Group of his intent to cooperatively work with the Stakeholders Group. He did emphasize, however, that Sunnyside would have to directly accomplish the monitoring work defined in the agreement, but that the results would be shared with the Group. Furthermore, he indicated his intent to share information that they have developed on specific sites.

Group Response to Actions

The Group agreed that further comments from individuals would be submitted directly to the Division. They decided to submit a general brief statement of support. Steve Fearn, Peter Butler, and Bill Simon will prepare it based on the comments recorded. That statement will be sent directly to the WQCD given the short time period available.

Ongoing Topics

Workgroup Reports. Neither the Monitoring and Feasibility Studies Workgroups gave reports; both were meeting the following day. The Group deferred to the Monitoring Workgroup the status of the CDPHE/EPA sampling plan and associated discussions with the two agencies.

Coordinator's Report. Bill Simon passed out a draft of an expanded goals and objectives statement that now included strategies and tasks. Peter Butler's proposed site selection criteria was also distributed with a notation that it is being applied in the priority site selection for Mineral Creek drainage. Bill asked that both documents be reviewed with comments to be provided within two weeks. Bill also gave a status of the library series presentations. On the previous night the project manager for Idarado talked about that cleanup effort and its relationship to the State. Bill further mentioned his upcoming trip to Denver where he will meet with EPA and with the Animas Resources Group along with talking at a legal seminar on watershed activities.

Other Topics

Criticism Voiced Towards the Group. A lengthy discussion ensued on the issue of an ongoing source of criticism recently published in the local paper towards the Group and the process. Both Katherine Foster and Gary Thrash expressed concern that has emerged in their agencies over whether these letters of criticism reflect the general views of the community. Two options of response were debated -- 1) a direct Group response to the letters in the paper or 2) a less direct response based on periodic statements to the paper over time covering what the Group is doing. Use of the Silverton paper was viewed as key for communicating with the public. This topic will need to be discussed further at the next meeting.

Discussion of Regulatory Issues with Dave Holm. Because of the lengthy discussion on the previous topic, the Group was not able to enter into this discussion.

Next Meeting

The following meeting was scheduled for April 25 at 6:00 pm. The Group asked that it again be held in the school music room. Key topics to be addressed are to include:

- continue with information to the public issues
- upcoming investigative issues including the biological work in the Canyon
- hydrologic controls for the summer

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 pm. By then the energy level had subsided significantly.